

112

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M No.15350 of 2018
Date of Decision: 18.04.2018

Sadhvi Manju Jayoti Ji Maharaj and another

....Petitioners

Vs

Punjab National Bank and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. A.K. Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioners seek issuance of necessary directions to respondents No.1 and 2 to investigate a fraudulent transaction of advancement of loan from respondent No.3 in favour of loanee in respect of residential house whereupon Jain Temple was constructed in the year 1992 after a proper gift deed executed on 11.08.1992. The gift was for a specific purpose for construction of religious place with a rider that the said land was not to be sold. The possession was given to the donee i.e. petitioner No.2. After execution of gift deed, Jain Temple came to be constructed on the area measuring 13-1/3 Marlas with the donations from followers of Jain Dharam. The building was constructed after approval of site plan by Municipal Corporation,

Jagadhri. Even electric and water connection were provided to the Jain Temple. One Ravinder Panjeta started claiming himself to be attorney of petitioner No.2 and executed a sale deed in respect of the property in question in favour of his mother on 18.05.2004. Thereafter, Kiran Panjeta along with her another son namely Rajiv Panjeta raised a loan of Rs.3 lacs from respondent No.3 for the purpose of construction of a dwelling house.

A complaint has already been made before Chief Vigilance Officer for investigation in respect of fraudulent advancement of loan by Punjab National Bank in favour of wrongdoers, but no action has been taken.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Rajiv Sharma, A.P.P., UT, Chandigarh, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2.

In view of nature of order, which this Court proposes to pass there is no necessity of filing any reply, as no order prejudicial to the interest of either party is being passed.

At this stage, without meaning anything on the merits of the case, respondent No.2 can be asked to have a fair look on the grievance of the petitioners and decide the representation dated 28.02.2018 in accordance with law without being influenced by any statement of fact made hereinabove.

Disposed of.

18.04.2018

jyoti

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No